## AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 19.

The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 19, replaces the original

sheet including Figure 19.

## REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 16, 18 and 19 stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended these claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant has amended these claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Xu et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The optical edge router according to the initially-filed claim corresponds to reference symbols A2 and B2 in Xu et al. Applicant believes that the routers indicated by A2 and B2 in Xu et al. maintains only information associated with the interface of a

router which will be feasible to be connected by the routers A2 and B2, i.e., Client Access Point (CAP) information. For example, a request for establishing an optical path is transferred from the router A2; and an Ingress BGP speaker (X1, etc., in FIG. 1 of Xu et al.) decides a BGP Next Hop, i.e., a path in an optical network (see item 8, in page 7 of Xu et al.). That is, the role of deciding the path in the optical network belongs to the BNE including the X1, etc.

In contrast, the optical edge router according to the initially-filed claim 1 maintains an optical network control instance in itself acknowledges not only information associated with end points of an optical path but also resource information including topology in the optical network. This is a very important point since this feature enables selecting of the optical path which is about to be established, thereby achieving multilayer liaison. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over Xu. Claims 4 and 5 recite similar limitations and thus should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ueno. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ueno discloses a method for reducing the load associated with producing additional labels and deleting them in an MPLS network. In contrast, the present invention according to the initially-filed Claim 6 relates to an attempt to reduce load associated with lookup process in an Egress-side IP router used in communication carried out by two IP routers connected by an optical path directly in an optical network.

In a common MPLS network, label swap provides data transmission in an MPLS path (in an LSP) linking label value and an output interface directly. In contrast, an Egress router output from the MPLS path (LSP) is configured to retrieves an IP address of a beneficiary, and then to decide a next HOP (output interface).

Regarding a process conducted by the Egress router, Paragraph [0037] of Ueno et al. merely discloses "the label stack area of two layers is deleted, and a packet is output from the packet transfer network (packet 106)".

Applicant believes that selecting an output interface based on a label in the Egress router necessitates a method for adding another label (identifier) relative to an LSP transmission label in an Ingress router, or a method for providing LSPs separately per Egress output interface between a common pair of Ingress-Egress routers. However, Ueno not disclosing methods as such simply discloses an MPLS transfer method in an ordinary LSP.

Therefore, applicant does not believe that an ordinary skilled person in the art would be able to conceive a cutting-through method as recited in the initially-filed claim 6 based on Ueno et al. Claims 4 and 5 recite similar limitations and thus should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al in view of Eric et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In summary, in a second full paragraph in page 25, the Examiner indicated that the object of the present invention in accordance with the initially-filed Claim 16 can be achieved in view of Xu et al. and Ueno et al.

However, the Applicant believes that the information in an optical network maintained by a router (A2, etc.) of Xu et al. relates only to an address of an opposing device which will be an end point of an optical path. That is, the information of Xu et al. does not maintain the information relating the inside of the optical network. More specifically, the information of Xu et al. cannot refer to topology information of an optical network, i.e., the "connection information with respect to line-exchanging-network" which the cooperative control sections of the initially-filed Claim 16 of the present application receive together with "connection information with respect to packet-exchange".

Therefore, mere combining of a label-stacking method of Ueno et al. and GMPLS of Xu et al. cannot achieve the object of the present invention in accordance with the initially-filed Claim 16, i.e., to provide a packet exchanger capable of disposing communication lines optimally among packet exchangers by using information from a line exchange network (see page 8, lines 13 to 17 of the initially-filed English specification of the present application). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 16, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over this combination of references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2008

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600